Linguistica Silesiana 35, 2014
ISSN 0208-4228

KRYSTYNA WARCHAŁ
University of Silesia

THE FACE OF A SCHOLAR: SELECTED INTERPERSONAL STRATEGIES IN JOURNAL ARTICLE INTRODUCTIONS

This paper refers to face and face-work to account for the ways in which academic authors strive to satisfy the need to establish their credibility as experts in the field, to present their research as a valuable addition to the existing knowledge, and to confirm their status as insiders – experienced members of the academic discourse community – in introductions to English-language linguistics articles. It relates the concern for face to the revised Create-a-Research-Space (CARS) model [John Swales, *Genre Analysis*, Cambridge: CUP, 1990] of rhetorical moves to better understand the choices the authors make in order to indicate a gap in the existing knowledge, to announce how their research intends to fill it in, and, in effect, to produce a publishable text. In particular, it examines references to other scholars and their research and explicit comments on the author's own work and experience in 50 journal article introductions. The presented strategies are evidence of a dialogue the writing scholar undertakes with the discourse community by laying emphasis on contextualization of the research among other texts, by placing his/ her findings in relation to other findings, by seeking acceptance for his/ her claims, and by attending to the social needs of others.

1. Introduction

Goffman's (1967) concept of face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (p. 5) has inspired a large number of studies into face-to-face communication, the different strands of research including the politeness framework (introduced by Brown and Levinson 1987 and taken up in various ways by other authors, e.g., Conlan 2005; Ukosakul 2005; Bargiela-Chiappini et al. 2007; Bousfield 2008), ethnomethodology and discourse analysis (e.g., Myers 2000; Arundale 2010; Haugh 2010; Ruhi 2010), and cross-cultural and indigenous non-English-centered approaches to social interaction (e.g., Haugh and Hinze 2003; Pizziconi 2003; Haugh 2007; Jakubowska 2007; Ruhi and Işik-Güler 2007; Bogdanowska-Jakubowska 2010). More recently, voices have been raised to suggest that the notion should be disentangled from the theory of politeness (Watts 2003; Locher and Watts 2005; Sifianou 2012) and viewed from a multi-level perspective informed by theories of identity (Haugh 2007; Spencer-Oatey 2007), and that it might be useful to return to and re-examine Goffman's original concept to arrive at a better understanding of face, embracing its interactional, relational, cognitive, strategic, and moral side (Bargiela-Chiappini 2003, 2013). While there is a rich tradition of inquiry into face-work in spoken genres, immediate, face-to-face contacts naturally providing a rich source of data (e.g., Myers 2000; Heisler et al. 2003; Haugh 2010), face phenomena in written texts seem to have received less attention. With regard to academic written discourse, Myers (1989) uses Brown and Levinson's framework to analyse politeness strategies in molecular genetics articles, in particular those related to making claims to knowledge, and in his studies on hedging in textbooks and research articles Hyland (1994, 1996, 1998) highlights its role in shaping the writer-reader relationship, in particular in strategically avoiding "ex-cathedra assertions" (Hyland 1998: 178). Other authors focus on specific resources that are evidence of how the authors perceive their relationship with expected readers (Kuo 1999) and that might be used to avoid direct imposition or conflict (e.g., Martínez 2001; Martín-Martín and Burgess 2004; Warchał 2008; Warchał 2010; Łyda and Warchał 2011; or, for academic spoken discourse, Łyda 2007) or to achieve solidarity with the audience (e.g., Koutsantoni 2004) rather than look at a text as a space where face is being constructed and enacted between the author and the academic discourse community. Face is here understood as the perception of the self the author negotiates with his or her audience by positioning him/herself as a researcher, writer and colleague in relation to others and by attending to the community's professed values and the public self-images of its members as scholars, readers and fellow academics. This paper looks into introductions to linguistics journal articles and argues that the concern for face underlies much of what the authors do to introduce their research to the audience.

As any other social encounter, academic communication is subject to various norms and conventions, such as the need to establish one's own credibility as an expert in the field, to present one's research as a valuable addition to the existing knowledge, and to confirm one's status as an insider – an experienced member of the academic community – by displaying respect for others' work, their contribution to the field and their professional self-image. This paper refers to face and face-work to account for the ways academic authors strive to satisfy some of those needs in introductions to English-language articles. It relates the concern for face to the revised Create-a-Research-Space (CARS) model (Swales 1990) of rhetorical moves to better understand the choices the authors make in order to indicate a gap in the existing knowledge, to announce how their own research intends to fill it in, and, in effect, to produce a publishable text. In particular, it examines signals of the presence of other members of the discourse community in the introductions to linguistics journal articles – such as references to other scholars and their research – and explicit comments on the author's own work and experience. Section 2 outlines the transition from the positivist, objectivist view of knowledge to an approach grounded in social constructionism to present academic communication – including typically non-interactional, written genres – as essentially dialogic and introduces the search for consensus and the need to construct disagreement as important rhetorical principles underlying Anglophone academic discourses. Section 3 presents the results of the analysis, preceded by a short outline of the structure of the introduction to the academic article. Section 4 offers some concluding remarks.

2. Academic communication: the status of knowledge and some underlying values

The positivist view of knowledge as a process of accumulation of data in the form of atomic propositions about empirical facts has been shown not to be the only model of scientific development, and perhaps not the one best suited to explain the human condition – human situation in the world, the relationship with the world of objects and other people, artifacts, and the rationale for action (Berger and Luckmann 1967; Kuhn 1970; Quine 1975).[1] In particular, Berger and Luckmann (1967) have argued that knowledge is relative to the social contexts in which it emerges, that it is a product of a complex, multi-level process of legitimation of a socially shared vision of the world, and that it "objectifies this world through language and the cognitive apparatus based on language … [ordering] it into objects to be apprehended as reality" (p. 84). The role of society and language in the generation of knowledge means that rather than aim at obtaining a faithful representation of an objectively given reality, knowledge can be construed as a product of society, created in the act of using language, in social interactions between members of a community, with a view to explaining this reality which is available to and agreed upon by this particular group. As Canagarajah (2002) observes, it is constituted in "the linguistic activity of the members in debating, revising, and legitimizing the 'paradigms' that make sense to them." On this view, language appears not so much a tool for description of knowledge as the substance of which it is formed in a complex process of social negotiation of reality.

---

[1] Outside strictly academic contexts, the plight of the rigorous method of scientific description through atomic (Russell 1922) or elementary propositions (Wittgenstein 1922) has been shown by Stefan Themerson in *Professor Mmas'a Lecture* (1984), which may be read as a mock dialogue with the scientific vision of the world proposed by logical positivism. Themerson's scientists "are very scientific," as Russell (1984) remarks in the Preface to the novel, but the kind of science they produce effectively prevents them from understanding the phenomena they aspire to describe.

This change in thinking about knowledge meant also a change in thinking about the language used to communicate it. Since on this understanding knowledge is internal to society rather than steadily anchored in some external reality discovered and reported on independently of the complex systems of beliefs, values and practices that constitute society, doing science is construed as an essentially dialogic activity, involving the researcher, fellow specialists, broader academic community, and the world of texts. As Hyland (2000:6) notes, "knowledge is not a privileged representation of non-human reality, but a conversation between individuals and between individuals and their beliefs."

This dialogic nature of seemingly monologic forms of discourse – which echoes Bakhtin's idea of words acquiring meanings in contact with other words, in constant interaction with past, present and future discourses (Bakhtin 1982: 101ff) – has been noticed by many authors. For example White (2003: 260) speaks of heteroglossic engagement to refer to language resources whose major role is: "to acknowledge, to engage with or to align [the textual voice] with respect to positions which are in some way alternatives to that being advanced by the text." It is through such resources as, e.g., epistemic markers, reporting verbs and rhetorical questions that the authors construct a dialogue with their readers and with different viewpoints, thus opening up a space for different, competing perspectives (White 2000, 2003). With regard to academic discourse, Myers (1989) shows how authors of scientific articles engage with their audiences to display respect for their contributions and to present themselves to these audiences as "humble servants of the discipline" (p. 4). Swales (1990) draws attention to the ways authors of research articles anticipate, analyze and disarm potential criticism of their claims to knowledge, thus turning what might appear a simple account of the research process into a complex dialogue with inquisitive and demanding readership. Along similar lines, Hyland (2000, 2001, 2005, 2010) speaks of the interactive nature of writing, of the writer's need to project an audience to effectively construct a shared understanding, negotiate concepts, and argue the point advanced in the text, and of the need to establish proximity – a relationship with the readers which creates optimum conditions for acceptance of the author's ideas. Writing science is thus construed as a dialogue between the author and the projected reader in the presence of a wider audience – members of the academic community whose texts are invoked, who have similar research interests, or who for some other reasons may be interested in the author's findings. Each of the parties involved in this interaction comes to the scene with their public self-image based on the set of values shared by the discourse community but defined according to the role they play in this particular context. It is the author's concern for the integrity of these public self-images that is the main focus of this paper.

Ways of academic communication reflect the understanding of knowledge, the role of language in its generation, and the set of fundamental principles professed by a particular discourse community. While all these underlying elements have been shown to be subject to cultural variation (e.g., Clyne 1987;

Hinds 1987; Kaplan 1987; Strevens 1987; Mauranen 1993; Duszak 1994, 1997; Čmejrková 1996; Connor 1996; Čmejrková and Daneš 1997), the Western tradition of scholarship is believed to espouse such values as politeness towards fellow researchers, respect for their work, modesty reflected in the emphasis on disciplinary development rather than individual achievement, honesty with regard to the handling of data and others' contribution to one's own findings, respect for the readers and their knowledge, experience and expectations, and responsibility for the precision and clarity of argumentation (Hinds 1987; Myers 1989; Swales 1990; Hyland 1994). These values are connected with the perspective on knowledge as socially constructed, based on a consensus between community members as to what constitutes science (as opposed to non-scientific inquiry), the present state of disciplinary knowledge, and legitimate academic practice. To become partners in the academic dialogue, individual researchers must try to fit in with the existing consensus and, presenting themselves as competent members of the community, seek acceptance for their own claims to knowledge. As Myers (1989: 5) remarks, "the writer must stay within a certain consensus to have anything to say to members of his or her discipline." The search for consensus and consideration for the face of the academic discourse community and one's own is therefore an important motivation for scholar's linguistic and rhetorical choices.

At the same time, scholars must reach beyond the disciplinary state of the art to publish their research results. They must persuade the reviewers that their contributions deserve sharing with other members of the community, and readers or listeners that the texts are worth their time. To do this, they create a research space (Swales 1990) either by criticising prior research (as shown, e.g., by Myers 1989; Hyland 2000; Martín-Martín and Burgess 2004; Hunston 2005) or by providing so far unconsidered data, which may shed new light on the object of study or lead to its reassessment. In this way, while in principle staying within the established disciplinary consensus, they set themselves apart from other researchers and previous literature, with a view to convincing the readership that their contribution offers new scientific perspectives, merits serious consideration and deserves the status of new knowledge – status granted by consensus of the discourse community. Potentially face-threatening, this act of creating and capturing the research space has been shown to be one of the most salient rhetorical moves taken by Anglophone academic authors in research genres. The search for consensus on the one hand, and the need to construct disagreement on the other may thus be said to give academic communication its characteristic rhetorical profile (Myers 1989; Swales 1990; Hunston 2005; Łyda 2007; Warchał 2010).

3. Face-oriented strategies in article introductions

3.1. Article introductions

Among professional academic genres, journal articles take the central position because of the number of texts published, their importance in the professional development of individual scholars, and their impact on the development of the discipline (Swales 1990, 2004). Of the standard sections of research articles, introductions have received special attention in genre and English for Academic Purposes studies (e.g., Swales 1981; Duszak 1994; Golebiowski 1998, 1999; Samraj 2002) because it is on their basis that the first – and often lasting – impressions of the whole are formed. Introduction is therefore a section where the authors not only introduce their research – for example by specifying its subject matter, scope, methodology and key theoretical concepts – but also attempt to win their readers by promising new data, an original approach, or interesting implications and to present themselves as experienced scholars, expert writers and competent members of the academic community by displaying various degrees of authority, awareness of their audience, and solidarity.

Possibly the most influential analysis of the structure of introductions to English language research articles is Swales (1981, 1990), who proposes a CARS model of rhetorical moves taken by academic authors to successfully introduce their research to the reviewers, readers and the rest of the community. Swales (1990: 140ff) identifies three such moves, which he further divides into steps. Move 1, Establishing a territory, introduces the topic and establishes its significance by Claiming centrality (Step 1), Making topic generalizations (Step 2) and Reviewing items of previous research (Step 3). Move 2, Establishing a niche, indicates the need for the current research which arises from some important aspects of the matter being so far overlooked, misrepresented or underexplored, and is realized by Counter-claiming (Step 1A), Indicating a gap (Step 1B), Question-raising (Step 1C), or Continuing a tradition (Step 1D). Finally, Move 3, Occupying the niche, announces how the need introduced in Move 2 is going to be satisfied by the current research. This is done by Outlining purposes (Step 1A) or Announcing present research (Step 1B), Announcing principal findings (Step 2), and Indicating RA structure (Step 3). While it has been shown that moves may sometimes be omitted, that their order is subject to variation, that cyclic realizations are not impossible, and that the cross-cultural validity of the model in its original shape may be limited, Swales' analysis of article introductions remains the most comprehensive and stimulating account of how academic authors introduce their research and themselves to their audience.

3.2. The corpus

The material for this study was a set of 50 introductions to journal articles drawn at random from a larger corpus of 200 complete papers published between the years 2001-2006 in five English-language journals internationally recognized in the area of linguistics: *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Language and Communication*, *Language Sciences*, *Lingua*, and *Linguistics and Philosophy*. The analyzed material included 10 introductions from each journal. The size of the corpus approximated 41 thousand running words, the average length of introduction being somewhat over 800.[2] The length of these sections varied considerably from 154 words to 2,495. There was no direct relationship between the length of the introduction and the journal; actually the longest and the shortest introductions came from *Language Sciences*.

The introductions were analyzed in terms of the presence of others in the text – typically associated with rhetorical Moves 1 and 2 – and the presentation of the self – typically associated with Move 3. Although the presence of others can be acknowledged by the author in a variety of ways, such as the use of citations, inclusive first-person pronouns, epistemic modality markers, imperatives, concessive and conditional clauses, and questions (e.g., Swales et al. 1998; Kuo 1999; Varttala 1999; Koutsantoni 2004; Hyland 2005; Łyda 2007; Hewings et al. 2010; Warchał 2010), here only direct references are considered to: other scholars, explicitly identified texts other than the one being introduced (excluding self-citations), and references to unspecified research. The presentation of the self is limited to: self-citations, evaluative comments on the research introduced and signals of defensive attitude.

3.3. Results

3.3.1. Presence of others

Generally speaking, only three introductions made no reference to other sources: one from *Language and Communication*, one from *Language Sciences*, and one from *Linguistics and Philosophy*. All three were markedly shorter than average. The vast majority of references to prior research in the remaining 47 introductions were not accompanied by overt signals of evaluation – these non-evaluative references were present in 44 texts (Examples 1 and 2 illustrate integral and non-integral citations respectively; Swales, 1990) – but the fact that the author chose to explicitly acknowledge these and not other contributions to the field may be interpreted not only in terms of focusing on selected aspects of the problem, raised by these particular scholars, but also in terms of respect due to works considered as significant, influential, or formative.

(1) *In all of the utterances above,* well *indicates that the following utterance is in some way at odds with a previous assertion, a function of* well *described by Schiffrin* (1985: 641). (JP2003-1)

---

[2] All counts are made with WordSmith 5 (Scott 2008).

(2) *Although it never developed as an auxiliary language, it nevertheless played a very influential role in both the development of functional linguistics and in the emergence of English as an international language (Halliday, 1978; Goodman and Graddol, 1996).* (LC2005-6)

Apart from these factual references, which may be interpreted as (selectively) reporting what has been done in the area so far, 25 introductions (that is half of the examined text samples) included positive evaluation of others' contributions, thus explicitly indicating their impact. Perhaps most direct – and comparatively rare, attested only in three introductions – were personal references to other scholars as eminent representatives of the field (Example 3). More frequent were highly positive comments about others' research, recorded in 10 introductory sections, marked with evaluative adjectives (Examples 4–6), adverbs (7), or emphatic syntax (8). These examples can be interpreted in terms of positive politeness mechanisms.

(3) *Introduced in the late 1970s and early 1980s by <u>the leading generative linguists</u> Noam Chomsky and Kenneth Hale (see especially Chomsky, 1981 and Hale, 1983), these apparently technical terms of art point in an especially precise way at fundamental aspects of language structure, while at the same time marking out a conceptual nexus in which many aspects of modernity and cultural history are also implicated.* (LC2004-1)
(4) *In his <u>comprehensive survey of NWC phonological systems</u>, Chirikba (1996) classifies the dialects of Abkh(-Aba) ... thus: North Abkh (T'ap') vs South Abkh, itself incorporating South-western (Sadz) vs South-eastern (Ahch'ypsy, Bz[yp], Ts'abal, Abzh[ywa]), whilst Ashkhar forms an intermediate stage, closer to the southern group.* (L2005-1)
(5) *In a series of papers beginning in the late 1980s, Jacobson develops <u>a novel and provocative theory</u> of binding that does entirely without movement or variables.* (LP2005-7)
(6) *There are <u>some excellent treatments of the globalization of literary creations</u>, such as Spivak (1988), Bhabha (1994), Pollock (2000), Mignolo (1998, 2000), Apter (2001), Aravamudan (2001) to name just a few.* (LC2005-6)
(7) *Davidson (1967) <u>argued convincingly</u> that a use of a verb does not stand for a particular event; rather, the verb picks out a kind of event, and the logical form of a sentence says that an event of that kind occurs*. (LP2002-12)
(8) *<u>Not only has Harris exposed the flawed theoretical assumptions upon which the language myth rests</u>, he has also explained why the myth takes the precise form that it has.* (LC2005-2)

In many cases, however, positive evaluation of prior research was found to take milder forms, with comments focused on its application to particular problems, in particular those raised by the authors themselves. References of this kind were attested in eight of the 50 introductions examined. It is worth noting that in these examples positive evaluation often coincided with the use of the first person pronoun and with the indication (Examples 9–10) or announcement (11) of the author's purpose (Move 3). In these cases, prior research seemed to provide justification for the potentially face-threatening act of occupying the research space. It may seem that in this way the authors invited their colleagues to the established niche.

(9) *I think Predelli's work helps us to better understand the interface between these two approaches, and to show the importance of theories of utterances for pragmatics* (JP2003-5)

(10) *I have found the framework of conceptual blending (Fauconnier and Turner, 2002) to be especially useful for thinking about the relations between conceptual and material structure.* (JP2005-6)

(11) *Much research in the 60s and 70s explored these connections (e.g. Akmajian, 1970; Pinkham and Hankamer, 1975). More recently, Percus (1996) has proposed that cleft sentences in English be derived from a structure with a headless relative in subject position ... Whether or not these researchers are correct about English, I will show that their arguments apply very elegantly to the Malagasy data.* (L2001-5)

In four texts, references to others with some elements of positive evaluation were also used as a means to converse with and draw additional support from other authors and their research, as in (12), where the studies invoked provide some data which may add strength to the author's arguments. Finally, and on a very different note, explicitly positive comments were found to act as a counterbalance for criticism used to establish a niche, as in (13), which follows a polemic with the cited author. This change of perspective is anticipated by a signal of concession – a device which allows to uphold a view without denying another, apparently conflicting view (although often denying possible but not intended implications of this other view; Łyda, 2007). In Example (13), the writer states that the discussed approach does make an important contribution to the field, without distancing himself from his earlier critical remarks but denying possible conclusions that may be drawn from this criticism (namely that the approach is worthless). A reversed situation was observed in three other introductions, where positive evaluation served to introduce criticism and so acted as a lead-in to establishing a niche (Examples 14, 15). Whether acting as a counterbalance or a lead-in to Move 2, positive comments attend to the professional face of the cited scholar, whose expert status is not challenged, and to the face of the writer as an objective, unbiased and fair researcher.

(12) *Interestingly, work by Steriade (1991), Crowhurst (1991), and Hyman (1992) suggests that weight criteria are often inconsistent within languages.* (L2002-3)

(13) *Nevertheless, the variable-free approach has something new and insightful to say about crossover. . . Given the standard crossover explanation in*

terms of long-distance LF movement and co-indexation, the fact that it is possible to formulate a local cross-over constraint is quite interesting in its own right and a large plus in favor of Jacobson's program. (LP2005-7)

(14) *However, these works, while they do appeal to actual discourse-based utterances, still center their analyses on examples with one to two turns or sentences, and thus do not capture the fullness of the interactive potential of the forms in question.*(LS2002-1)

(15) *While highly thought-provoking, the analysis she proposes suffers from some of the inadequacies of Relevance Theory*. (LS2003-8)

While positive evaluation was rather expectedly associated with reviewing previous research (Move 1), mitigating the potentially face-threatening effect of introducing the present research (Move 3), and alleviating criticism (Move 2), it was expected that negative evaluation would be confined to counter-claiming and indicating a gap (Move 2). Somewhat surprisingly, it was found nearly evenly distributed across the three moves.

Generally, signals of negative evaluation of others' work were found in 24 introductions, of which 17 contained explicit references to the criticized texts and seven referred vaguely to other research. The most frequent type of criticism, attested in 12 introductions, was leveled at a particular approach and associated with reviewing literature (Move 1). Interestingly, in half of the excerpts exact references were absent, although they would be inferable to expert readers, as in (16). The choice not to quote concrete texts can be interpreted as a symptom of face-work: firstly, the critical point is established but there is no specific target of the critique who might feel personally attacked, and secondly, by refraining from direct criticism the author succeeds in displaying his face as a polite, socially competent member of the discourse community. In (17) the author uses a rhetorical question to invite the readers to draw the (critical) conclusion on their own and to solicit agreement. In this case the sharply critical point is negotiated rather than merely stated, with the responsibility for negative evaluation shared between the writer and the reader. Another strategy to minimize the effect of the negative comment is shown in (18), where the author added a defensive footnote lest her remark should be misunderstood and her criticism overinterpreted. The impact of negative evaluation can also be alleviated through attribution, as in (19), where criticism is cited rather than expressed.

(16) *Because the identities of these entities depend so much on relationships among other entities, they are often characterized as abstract, distinct from concrete entities, whose identities depend primarily on continuity of material composition. This characterization has its drawbacks, however, since some of these entities share in more of the prototypical properties of abstract entities than others.* (L2003-3)

(17) *There has even been considerable research embracing a model where things start out in one place, move, and then get put back by 'reconstruction' for the*

purpose of the semantic interpretation. Could anyone look at such a model seriously and not suspect that something is being missed? (LP2002-8)

(18) *I do not mean to suggest that Barbe (1995), Alexander (1997), and Clift (1999) are not concerned with interaction in context; what I want to emphasize is that each of them starts from one of the reifications, gets caught in definitions, and then either explores a range of interaction classifiable under the reification (Barbe and Alexander), or uses examples of interaction in context to challenge current assumptions and definitions (Clift) but still works within a definitional framework.* (JP2003-9)

(19) *But, as Kulick points out, there is a central flaw in much of this work, drawing as it does on a tautology: people who are lesbian and gay speak in a way that is defined as 'gay language'; and people who talk a 'gay language' are, thus, gay*. (LC2003-4)

Another important occasion for negative evaluation of others' research was creating a research space (Move 2), an association observed in nine introductions. Again, plain criticism was infrequent, the most direct example being (20), with most remaining instances resorting to concessive contrast to give counterbalance to negative evaluation (21) or providing vague reference to prior research (22).

(20) *In this paper I will put grammaticalization under the microscope and conclude that such claims are unwarranted*. (LS2001-5)

(21) *However, these works, while they do appeal to actual discourse-based utterances, still center their analyses on examples with one to two turns or sentences, and thus do not capture the fullness of the interactive potential of the forms in question*. (LS2002-1)

(22) *Up to now, investigations of syllable weight have focused on the nature of cross-linguistic variation in weight criteria and the phonological representations capturing this variation without examining possible motivations behind the language-specific adoption of a particular weight criterion. It thus remains unknown whether the language specific setting of the coda weight parameter is at all predictable from independent properties of the languages concerned.* (L2002-3)

The third frequent use of negative evaluation was associated with announcing the findings of the introduced research (Move 3), attested in seven texts. Also in these cases direct criticism, as in (23), was rare, the preferred strategy being vague reference to incompleteness of existing accounts, as in (24), or limiting rather than denying the validity of prior research, as in (25).

(23) *These findings indicate that the categories of reception and presentation markers (as discussed by Jucker and Smith, 1998) do not adequately account for variation in DM use*. (JP2003-1)

(24) *A hidden reality, apparently undocumented up to this point, is the fact that—given the appropriate circumstances—even beginning English learners are able to initiate and participate in joking behavior with each other and Americans.* (JP2003-9)
(25) *In Romance languages, for example, it has been claimed that dative case is assigned to any verbal argument that is thematically a goal (Alsina, 1996: 175). We shall see, however, that the mapping is not so predictable, at least in Germanic. I show that not only are goal arguments not necessarily marked dative, but dative can be mapped to theme arguments as well as goals. Furthermore, even in the Germanic languages where the prototypical IO is dative, the IO is not always marked dative.* (L2001-1)

To conclude this part of the overview, when associated with establishing a niche, criticism of others provided justification for the potentially face-threatening act of capturing the research space in the next move. When combined with indicating findings, negative evaluation created the background against which the author's claim and results could be better appreciated. In both cases negative remarks were rarely direct or unmitigated. The next section focuses on the strategies of presentation of the self, including self-citations, signals of positive evaluation, and markers of defensive attitude.

3.3.2. Presentation of the self

Self-citations occurred in 17 introductions, of which seven came from *Journal of Pragmatics*. Integral self-citations were used by 11 authors, of whom five combined reference to prior research with the first-person pronoun, as in (26). In four texts, reference to one's own research was accompanied by a signal of positive evaluation, as in (27).

(26) *As I note in Borsley (1994), one might reject the assumption that conjunctions are heads of coordinate structures but assume that they are heads of conjuncts.*(L2005-5)
(27) *The pervasiveness of conflicted weight criteria has recently been systematically demonstrated by a survey of weight in 381 languages in Gordon (1999).* (L2002-3)

Evaluative comments on the introduced research were associated with the importance of the topic undertaken (in five introductions) or – in more straightforward cases – with the adopted methodology and significance of the research itself (in 12 texts), and with the announced findings (in two sections). References to the subject matter appear the least direct strategy of building the positive image of one's own work as a significant, meaningful contribution, as illustrated in (28). In some cases, this type of positive evaluation is directly associated with establishing the niche, reinforcing the need for the introduced research and providing justification for claiming the research space, as in (29). In (30), the introduced research is put in positive light by indicating that it contributes to some fundamental problems for the discipline; this relevance to central topics is then a source of status.

(28) *This paper examines the role of physicians' progress notes in the professional socialization of medical residents. These notes … constitute a key training tool by means of which residents experience and internalize the cognitive processes which constitute medical reasoning and analysis, through the application of general principles to specific individual cases. They thus represent the record of the resident's acquisition and exercise of clinical judgment.* (JP2004-3)

(29) *This aspect of DM use is important because it gives us a broader picture of the pragmatic and socio-pragmatic functions of these particles … While some research addresses this function of DMs (e.g., Andersen et al., 1999), many questions remain about which DMs are associated with different speaker roles.* (JP2003-1)

(30) *Some of the most central debates in philosophy of language and philosophy of mind concern the question of our epistemic relation to our public language and our apparent ability to understand the speech of another member of our linguistic community. I will argue that the thesis explains how we understand the general structure of the atomic formulas of our public language.* (LP2004-2)

Perhaps more direct – and more frequent – was positive evaluation connected with the applied methodology and significance of the introduced research. This is often associated with delineating the purpose of the research (Move 3), as in (31), when the analysis is introduced as *a detailed account*. The positive picture of the investigation as particularly difficult and demanding is in this case further highlighted by references to the complexity of the subject matter. By contrast, Example (32) combines a reference to new data and original methodology with establishing a niche (Move 2), by indicating that the obtained results call for a reassessment of some earlier findings. It is also worth noting that the threat to face posed by counter-claiming is here mitigated by concessive contrast; in this way it is explicitly stated that many of the earlier findings are actually confirmed and provided additional support for. Example (33) juxtaposes the introduced research with earlier studies. The strength of the proposed solution can be appreciated by contrasting it with weaknesses of other approaches. It is interesting to note that the positive image of the introduced analysis rests solely on the negative evaluation of other proposals, expressed by *unrelated formalisms*, with which it is compared. No exact reference to these other studies is given in this niche-establishing move.

(31) *This essay provides a detailed account of the morphosyntax, semantics, and pragmatics of modal clitics in Q'eqchi'-Maya ... It details the complicated types of commitment events that are encoded and implicated in various contexts ... And it shows the ways in which these complicated, overlapping commitment events may be understood in terms of intentional states—from desire and worry to belief and hope.* (LC2006-2)

(32) *The resulting investigation uses new lines of evidence to substantiate many of the results of Asher (1993), but arrives at different conclusions from those of Asher on a number of key points*. (L2003-3)

(33) *Under our analysis, where each disharmonic sequence is subject to a distinct constraint, the morpheme structure constraints follow from the structure of the grammar. Under an analysis positing a general agreement constraint, the morpheme structure constraints must be expressed by unrelated formalisms.* (L2005-9)

Finally, positive image of one's own work was created by direct references to the obtained findings (Move 3), which can be presented as *intriguing* and therefore novel and particularly informative (34), or *substantial* and conclusive, as in (35).

(34) *Another intriguing result is that the crossover constraint proposed below makes crucial reference to linear order*. (LP2005-7)

(35) *Reference to entities introduced in coordinate structures, examined in Section 3, provides substantial further evidence regarding the semantic nature of the expressions involved ... In Section 4, results regarding quantification by amount quantifiers over the associated denotation domains provides a final piece of evidence for the nature of these domains and their semantic types*. (L2003-3)

Another approach to self-presentation was assuming defensive attitude, noticed in 19 introductions. This was accomplished by clarifying intentions and concepts, by limiting the scope of the research, by focusing on the difficulty of the task at hand, and by restricting the scope of critical remarks. Clarifying comments were found in 10 introductions. Most of them aimed at preventing misunderstanding or overinterpretation, as in (36) and (37). In (37), clarification contributes directly to identifying the research space the study aims to fill by pointing out where the problem with previous research exactly lies. In some other cases, these remarks provided explanation for the author's specific decisions, as in (38), where the author admits to having doubts about one point himself, or in (39), where the author gives the reasons for being frugal with references.

(36) *Saying that DMs do not change grammaticality judgments or truth conditions is not meant to imply that they do not carry meaning*. (JP2003-1)

(37) *The objection to LF is not that it necessitates an additional 'level' – for a level is nothing more than the by-product of the rule system, and so it is the nature of the rule system which is (or should be) of primary interest. But indeed this view does entail a more complex rule system; the claim that there is a level of LF (distinct from surface structures) necessitates an additional set of rules mapping between surface structures and LFs.* (LP2002-8)

(38) *The inclusion of 'drag queen' in this list is a particular choice on my part, and not one that all transgender-identified people —or drag queens —might agree with. Indeed, I include it here, somewhat reluctantly, only because many of my informants do so in their explanations of what 'transgender' encompasses.* (LC2003-4)

(39) *Similarly, the ideas that feed into this particular essay themselves have such a wide and rich history that I have despaired to producing a full set of references to previous work in the field(s) on which this work is based. Any detailed set of references would slight authors whose work has contributed importantly to this project. My impression is that the ideas on which I have relied are by now all common knowledge – and thus I have provided only minimal references.* (LP2002-12)

Remarks limiting the scope of the research were noted in seven introductions, six of which came from *Linguistics and Philosophy*. They announced what the introduced research did not intend to do, as in (40) and (41), which identify the purpose of the study in a negative way. Indeed, in (41) the negative statement of purpose is a lead-in to the proper statement of the claim. Another function of these limiting remarks was narrowing down the topic, as in (42), where the authors deliberately free themselves from discussion of some problematic cases, or justifying what might seem to the reader an omission or oversight, as in (43). In (44), which states the purpose of the introduced discussion, the author limits the significance of his contribution by calling it a remark rather than a paper or analysis.

(40) *This paper does not make any claims about the universality of the proposed analysis of clefts*. (L2001-5)

(41) *My purpose in this piece is not to provide detailed empirical arguments for or against any particular conception of this (although I will not try to hide what I believe – or at least hope – is correct). Rather, my purpose is to make the point that acceptance of a complex view does need to be argued for if a simpler view is available.* (LP2002-8)

(42) *However, we cannot illuminate these issues here, and we will therefore concentrate on underlying sentences such as (1) where the event-structure is clear*. (LP2001-5)

(43) *Further extensions, such as an application to epistemic indicatives (see below) and conditionals with conditional antecedents, are possible but left for future occasions*. (LP2005-3)

(44) *This remark evaluates some of the strengths and the weaknesses of the variable-free program in the course of extending the fragment in Jacobson (1999) to handle a more complete range of binding constructions, including those in (1).* (LP2005-7)

Another group of defensive comments were remarks emphasizing the difficulty of the task and in this way anticipating and disarming criticism. They appeared in three introductions. In (45), the comment is directly combined with the statement of purpose and gives the reason for the perhaps untypical structure of the text. Example (46) is the opening sentence of another introduction, with implicit statement of purpose, which provides justification for the approach taken by the author.

(45) *This is not an easy task because, as we will see, their starting points and theoretical priorities are rather different, which makes it difficult to compare them in terms of a single set of parameters or issues ... For this reason, the paper has a somewhat "fugue-like" structure, considering first some similarities, then differences, then returning to similarities, and again to differences*. (LS2003-4)

(46) *It is hard to do philosophy without making distinctions, even when philosophizing about Zhuangzi's questioning of distinctions*. (LS2004-4)

A very different function of defensive comments, illustrated in (47), is limiting the scope of critical remarks. Appearing in a footnote, it clarifies the scope of criticism which serves to establish a niche to be filled in by the author's approach to humor.

(47) *I do not mean to suggest that Barbe (1995), Alexander (1997), and Clift (1999) are not concerned with interaction in context; what I want to emphasize is that each of them starts from one of the reifications, gets caught in definitions, and then either explores a range of interaction classifiable under the reification (Barbe and Alexander), or uses examples of interaction in context to challenge current assumptions and definitions (Clift) but still works within a definitional framework.* (JP2003-9)

The overview of self-presentation strategies indicates that the positive image of the self was often built by rather direct and straightforward signals of evaluation typically associated with the rhetorical move of occupying the research space. Also frequent were defensive comments clarifying the author's purposes, often associated with establishing the niche or with the announcement of research goals.

3.3.3. Discussion

The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Face-oriented text features in article introductions (numbers refer to the number of introductions where the feature was attested).

PRESENCE OF OTHERS	
non-evaluative references	**44**
positive evaluation	**25**
of others	3
of others' work	10
of selected issues	8
to support one's findings	4
to counterbalance criticism	1
as a lead-in to criticism	3
negative evaluation	**24**
of an approach	12
to create a niche	9
of others' findings	7

PRESENTATION OF SELF	
self-citations	**17**
positive image	**18**
of the subject matter	5
of the method and research	12
of the findings	2
defensive attitude	**19**
clarification	10
limiting the scope of the study	7
emphasising difficulty	3
limiting the scope of criticism	1

With regard to the presence of others in the examined set of introductions, the vast majority of authors referred explicitly to prior research by other scholars to indicate continuity, establish affinities and introduce new elements. Half of the texts contained explicit positive evaluation of prior research, thereby displaying politeness towards other scholars, soliciting their help in capturing the research space, and balancing criticism – either to deny possible conclusions which may be drawn from the critical remarks and which may put the cited author's and the writer's face at risk, or to attend to the face of the cited scholar, whose status is confirmed and only selected aspects of his or her contribution challenged. Most popular types of positive evaluation were explicit praise of others' research and favorable comments on specific aspects of their work. They build the positive image of the writer as a competent member of the discourse community, showing respect for the work of others and fair in the recognition of their contribution to the field. At the same time, they make it easier for the writer to capture the research space in a socially acceptable and less aggressive way by pointing out the extent to which one's own findings have benefitted from others' research and work.

At the same time, almost half of the introductions contained elements of negative evaluation of others' research. If used in the overview of literature, where they were most frequent, these comments were often found to be vague, directed at *previous studies* rather than concrete texts; additionally, the threat to face was sometimes minimized by restricting the scope of criticism or by attribution (or negotiation) of the critical points. These remarks on the one hand prepare the ground for the proper identification of the research space to be occupied by the introduced study, thereby justifying the undertaken research, and on the other help avoid direct confrontation. Similarly, if criticism was used to create a research space, the preferred strategies were in most cases indirect, either relying on vague references or employing a concessive contrast to counterbalance the negative evaluation. Critical remarks of others' findings were also often used to offset one's own findings. This face-threatening step was in most cases realized by vague references or by limiting rather than plainly confrontational strategy.

With regard to the presentation of the self, one-third of the introductions included self-citations. Self-citations draw attention to the authors' earlier achievements and established expertise in the field. They may also legitimize their claims to knowledge by showing that they have worked on the problem for a longer time and therefore have important insights to share. Thus, self-citations may be said to cater for the professional face of the writer as an expert.

A similar number of introductions built a favorable image of the research introduced by more or less explicit signals of positive evaluation. Drawing attention to the importance or centrality of the subject matter may be viewed as an indirect strategy of presenting one's own contribution as noteworthy without a direct claim to status. It may be somewhat surprising that this indirect strategy was comparatively rare in the studied corpus. More direct and most frequent in the examined set of introductions were explicit positive evaluation of the research, often associated with announcing the purpose of the study, and positive comments on one's findings. These two strategies, typically associated with capturing the research space, constitute the most direct claim to status in the examined material.

Another type of face-oriented strategy was defensive attitude, whose signals were found in almost 40% of the texts examined. In most cases it protected the writers' face by preventing misunderstanding their intentions or overinterpreting their claims. The defensive strategy of limiting the scope of the research and thus disarming potential accusations of important omissions was associated with one journal, which addresses perhaps the most interdisciplinary audience of all the journals represented in the corpus. This strategy seems therefore most context-sensitive of all those discussed here. Finally, defensive remarks were used to emphasize the difficulty of the task, providing justification for possible shortcomings and disputable choices, in this way anticipating and disarming criticism.

4. Conclusion

The purpose of this analysis was to look into some face-oriented interpersonal strategies taken by journal article authors who introduce their research to the audience. The article introduction is here viewed as a space where, apart from introducing the field, indicating the need for the study and announcing the objectives and organization of the text, the author negotiates with the academic audience his or her self-image not only as an expert scholar and expert writer but also as a competent member of the discourse community to which he or she belongs. This involves, on the one hand, acknowledgement of the presence of others and their impact on the development of this particular area of study, recognition of their contribution to the field discussed, and evaluation of the significance of their findings to the research introduced, and on the other, putting oneself and one's own work in positive light. Thus, the negotiated image of the self-as-an-insider goes beyond the disciplinary expertise and arises in a dynamic tension between the need to show respect for academic values, such as priority of disciplinary development and cooperation over individual achievement, methodological rigor, precision and honesty with regard to others contribution, the need to fit in with the established conventions of writing for academia, and the need to build a positive image of the self as an expert who has much to offer to the community's state of knowledge. As a result, the face of the writer reflects the values and expectations of the discourse community to which he or she belongs and in this sense is at the same time a manifestation of the community's collective face. The presented strategies are evidence of a dialogue the writing scholar undertakes with the discourse community by laying emphasis on contextualization of the research among other texts, by placing one's findings in relation to other findings, by seeking acceptance for one's own claims and by attending to the social needs of others, and so are evidence of complex face-work going on in what the positivist saw as a faceless representation of objective facts.

References

Arundale, R.B. 2010. Constituting face in conversation: face, facework, and interactional achievement. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2078-2105.

Bachtin, M. 1982 [1975]. *Problemy literatury i estetyki – Voprosy literatury i estetiki*. Trans. W. Grajewski. Warszawa: Czytelnik.

Bakhtin, M. 1982 [1975]. See Bachtin, M.

Berger, P.L., and Th. Luckmann 1967 [1966]. *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Penguin Books.

Bargiela-Chiappini, F. 2003. Face and politeness: New (insights) for old (concepts). *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1453-1469.

Bargiela-Chiappini, F. 2013. Enfleshing the imagined face: From Goffman to Lévinas. Plenary lecture delivered at CC2013FACE (Communication across Cultures: Face and Interaction), Institute of English, University of Silesia, Sosnowiec, Poland, April 26-27.

Bargiela-Chiappini, F., O-O. Chakorn, G. Chew Chye Lay, Y. Jung, K. C.C. Kong, Sh. Nair-Venugopal and H. Tanaka 2007. Eastern voices: enriching research on communication in business: A forum. *Discourse and Communication* 1(2): 131-152.

Bogdanowska-Jakubowska, E. 2010. *FACE. An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.

Bousfield, D. 2008. *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Brown, P., and S. Levinson 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, S. 2002. Multilingual writers and the academic community: Towards a critical relationship. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 1: 29–44.

Clyne, M. 1987. Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11: 211–247.

Čmejrková, S. 1996. Academic writing in Czech and English. In E. Ventola and A. Mauranen (eds.), *Academic Writing: Intercultural and Textual Issues*, 137–152. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Čmejrková, S., and F. Daneš 1997. Academic writing and cultural identity: the case of Czech academic writing. In A. Duszak (ed.), *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*, 41–61. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Conlan, Ch.J. 2005. Face threatening acts, primary face threatening acts, and the management of discourse. Australian English and speakers of Asian Englishes. In R. T. Lakoff and S. Ide (eds.), *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness*, 129-144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Connor, U. 1996. *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-Cultural Aspects of Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duszak, A. 1994. Academic discourse and intellectual styles. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 291–313.

Duszak, A. 1997. Cross-cultural academic communication: a discourse-community view. In A. Duszak (ed.), *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*, 11–39. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction Ritual. Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Golebiowski, Z. 1998. Rhetorical approaches to scientific writing: an English-Polish contrastive study. *Text* 18(1): 67–102.

Golebiowski, Z. 1999. Application of Swales' model in the analysis of research papers by Polish authors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 37: 231–247.

Haugh, M. 2007. Emic conceptualisations of (im)politeness and face in Japanese: Implications for the discursive negotiation of second language learner identities. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 657-680.

Haugh, M. 2010. Jocular mockery, (dis)affiliation, and face. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2106-2119.

Haugh, M., and C. Hinze 2003. A metalinguistic approach to deconstructing the concepts of 'face' and 'politeness' in Chinese, English and Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1581-1611.

Heisler, T., D. Vincent and A. Bergeron 2003. Evaluative metadiscursive comments and face-work in conversational discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1613-1631.

Hewings, A., Th. Lillis and D. Vladimirou 2010. Who's citing whose writings? A corpus based study of citations as interpersonal resource in English medium national and English medium international journals. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 9: 102–115.

Hinds, J. 1987. Reader versus writer responsibility: a new typology. In U. Connor and R.B. Kaplan (eds.), *Writing Across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text*, 141–152. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Hunston, S. 2005. Conflict and consensus: construing opposition in *Applied Linguistics*. In E. Tognini-Bonelli and G. Del Lungo Camiciotti (eds.), *Strategies in Academic Discourse*, 1–15. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hyland, K. 1994. Hedging in academic writing and EAP textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes* 13(3): 239-256.

Hyland, K. 1996. Writing without conviction? Hedging in science research articles. *Applied Linguistics* 17(4): 433-454.

Hyland, K. 1998. *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hyland, K. 2000. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Harlow: Longman.

Hyland, K. 2001. Bringing in the reader: addressee features in academic articles. *Written Communication* 18(4): 549–574.

Hyland, K. 2005. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. 2010. Constructing proximity: relating to readers in popular and professional science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 9: 116–127.

Jakubowska, E. 2007. Cultural transfer in the presentation of self. *Linguistica Silesiana* 28: 105-114.

Kaplan, R.B. 1987. Cultural thought pattern revisited. In U. Connor and R.B. Kaplan (eds.), *Writing Across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text,* 9–21. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Koutsantoni, D. 2004. Attitude, certainty and allusions to common knowledge in scientific research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3: 163–182.

Kuhn, Th.S. 1970 [1962]. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuo, Ch-H. 1999. The use of personal pronouns: role relationships in scientific journal articles. *English for Specific Purposes* 18(2): 121-138.

Locher, M.A., and R.J. Watts 2005. Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1: 9-33.

Łyda, A. 2007. *Concessive Relation in Spoken Discourse: A Study into Academic Spoken English*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.

Łyda, A., and K. Warchał 2011. Ethnic and disciplinary cultures and understatement: Litotic constructions in Polish and English linguistics and biology research articles. In J. Arabski and A. Wojtaszek (eds.), *Aspects of Culture in Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Learning*, 193-216. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Martínez, I.A. 2001. Impersonality in the research article as revealed by analysis of the transitivity structure. *English for Specific Purposes* 20: 227-247.

Martín-Martín, P., and S. Burgess 2004. The rhetorical management of academic criticism in research article abstracts. *Text* 24(2): 171–195.

Mauranen, A. 1993. *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric: A Textlinguistic Study*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang,.

Myers, G. 1989. The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles. *Applied Linguistics* 10(1): 1-35.

Myers, G. 2000. Becoming a group: face and sociability in moderated discussions. In S. Sarangi and M. Coulthard (eds.), *Discourse and Social Life*, 121-137. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Pizziconi, B. 2003. Re-examining politeness, face and the Japanese language. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1471–1506.

Quine, W. V.O. 1975. The nature of natural knowledge. In S. Guttenplan (ed.), *Mind and Language*, 67–81. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ruhi, Ş. 2010. Face as an indexical category in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2131-2146.
Ruhi, Ş., and H. Işik-Güler 2007. Conceptualizing face and relational work in (im)politeness: Revelations from politeness lexemes and idioms in Turkish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 681-711.
Russell, B. 1922 [1914]. *Our Knowledge of the External World*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
Russell, B. 1984 [1953]. Preface to *Professor Mmaa's Lecture* by Stefan Themerson. Woodstock, New York: Tusk/ Overlook,.
Samraj, B. 2002. Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes* 21: 1–17.
Scott, M. 2008. WordSmith Tools 5.0 for Windows. Liverpool: Lexical Analysis Software.
Sifianou, M. 2012. Disagreements, face, and politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 1554-1564.
Spencer-Oatey, H. 2007. Theories of identity and the analysis of face. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 639-656.
Strevens, P. 1987. Cultural barriers to language learning. In L.E. Smith (ed.), *Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes*, 169-178. New York: Prentice Hall.
Swales, J.M. 1981. *Aspects of Article Introductions*. Birmingham: The University of Aston.
Swales, J.M. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,.
Swales, J.M. 2004. *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Swales, J. M., U.K. Ahmad, Y-Y. Chang, D. Chavez, D.F. Dressen and R. Seymour 1998. Consider this: the role of imperatives in scholarly writing. *Applied Linguistics* 19(1): 97–121.
Themerson, S. 1984 [1953]. *Professor Mmaa's Lecture*. Woodstock, New York: Tusk/ Overlook.
Ukosakul, M. 2005. The significance of 'face' and politeness in social interaction as revealed through Thai 'face' idioms. In R.T. Lakoff and S. Ide (eds.), *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness*, 117-125. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Varttala, T. 1999. Remarks on the communicative functions of hedging in popular scientific and specialist research articles on medicine. *English for Specific Purposes* 18(2): 177–200.
Warchał, K. 2008. Claiming authority: modals of obligation and necessity in academic written English. The case of SHOULD. *Linguistica e Filologia* 27: 21-37. University of Bergamo.
Warchał, K. 2010. Moulding interpersonal relations through conditional clauses: Consensus-building strategies in written academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 9: 140–150.
Watts, R.J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
White, P.R.R. 2000. Dialogue and inter-subjectivity: reinterpreting the semantics of modality and hedging. In M. Coulthard, J. Cotterill and F. Rock (eds.), *Dialogue Analysis VII: Working with Dialogue*, 67-80. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
White, P.R.R. 2003. Beyond modality and hedging: a dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text* 23(2): 259-284.
Wittgenstein, L. 1922. *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*. Trans. C.K. Ogden. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd. Available online from Project Gutenberg at www.gutenberg.org [EBook #5740].